NATIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE POLICY
AND INDIVIDUAL MOTIVATION:
FOUR CASE STUDIES

By

DANA DEAN EBBETT

Bachelor of Arts

Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia

1976

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
May, 1988

Thesis
1988
E15m
cop.2

NATIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE POLICY

AND INDIVIDUAL MOTIVATION:

FOUR CASE STUDIES

Thesis Approved:

Ravi Sheorey
Thesis Advisor

Richard P. Batteiger

Bhaskaran Nayar

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

1302604

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Ravi Sheorey for his help and advice throughout my graduate studies here at Oklahoma State. Specifically, Dr. Sheorey suggested this general area for my thesis. In addition, Dr. P. B. Nayar was very helpful in recommending sources to get me started on my research, and he made himself available to discuss my progress on several occasions. In addition, I appreciate the careful reading and suggestions of Dr. Richard Batteiger, my third committee member.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ENGLISH IN QUEBEC.	15
III.	ENGLISH IN PLURALISTIC INDIA	28
IV.	ENGLISH IN THE TWO GERMAN STATES	42
V.	ENGLISH IN CENTRALIZED JAPAN	58
VI.	CONCLUSION	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY.		77

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the field of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL), which is characterized by a host of different teaching approaches, designs, and procedures (Richards & Rodgers, 1986), one of the few statements that would meet with almost universal acceptance is that the attitude of the learner greatly determines language learning success and thus, ultimately, the efficacy of a curriculum. Given the rough equation of success of a curriculum and positive motivation of students, I shall present four case studies (Quebec, Germany, India, and Japan) to explore the relationship between a government's explicit English language teaching policy and the degree of motivation one can infer on the part of the individual learner. My purpose is to study areas with ample data so that the ESL instructor could then pursue possible analogies with another host country where little or no documentation is available. The fact is that of the four areas under study here only Japan is a viable ESL market.

The analysis of the English language policy in each of the four areas will be based primarily on the four-part flow chart suggested by Strevens (1978). Here and elsewhere in

subsequent publications, Strevens has stressed reasons for the failure and success of certain national language programs. In order to help us conceptualize the nature of language learning in a formal curriculum, he suggests (p. 181) a four-part model that consists of the "community," the "language teaching profession," the "teacher," and the "learner." The idea is that any combination of the first three elements can affect the learner in terms of individual motivation to study a foreign language, although Strevens points out how an extremely supportive community can offset deficiencies in teachers. This thesis will investigate the first component of Strevens' flow chart--the community--which he divides into the "public will" and the "administration and organization." I shall concentrate on the administration in each of the four case areas (in the form of individual ministries of education) to see how in each of the four areas under study the policy towards English is explicitly stated and how specific policies can be inferred to affect the learner's motivation. Since an ESL instructor who is contemplating working abroad will have to deal initially at least with a government bureaucracy, I am interested in the degree to which knowledge of the explicit language policy is helpful. Specifically, I shall investigate the degree of consistency and honesty in stated English policy--the degree to which policies are actually enacted and whether an ESL instructor can put faith in official government language decisions.

Not surprisingly, individual government language policies vary drastically: some are clearcut and consistent; others are contradictory; still others are based on overt or implicit nationalism or elitism. In my view, ESL instructors will experience a lower level of frustration if they are aware of recent trends in government language policy. In addition, as Judd (1981, p. 63) points out, "Instructional programs that are compatible with the socio-political situations in which they are located are more likely to succeed while those that are in conflict with the English policy of a given country run a greater chance of failure." This seems obvious enough, but the language planning literature is full of examples of failure, bloated bureaucracies, and (by implication) frustrated teachers.

One fact is worth noting at the outset. In the present age of mass communications, stated government attitudes can change quickly. A case in point is the career of Rene Levesque, who died recently (November 1, 1987). Levesque was the charismatic leader of the Parti Quebecois and is largely credited with the readjustment of the status of English vis-a-vis French both in the schoolroom and in the workplace (Frazer, 1987). Once aware that official attitudes and policies can change quickly and that English instruction is often a highly charged issue in some foreign countries, the instructor must be sensitive to how student motivation can be affected. In speaking of language planning as a whole, Cobarubbias and Fishman (1983, p. 71)

note the following: "Official attitudes are important not only because of the granting of official status to a given language but because of the effect that official attitudes have upon the clustering and entrenchment of diverse language functions."

This thesis relies heavily on literature from the fields of language planning and attitudinal research, both subfields of sociolinguistics. I shall use the terms language planners, sociolinguists, and attitudinal researchers to describe individuals with different emphases within sociolinguistics. Specifically, language planners either describe or formulate language policy; "traditional" sociolinguists study language use in specific social contexts; and attitudinal researchers are primarily interested in gathering and manipulating statistical data.

The data for this thesis are drawn from a variety of sources. "Classics" of language planning (works by such scholars as Fishman, Cobarubbias, and Smith) form the basis for all general information and terminology. I have found The Times Educational Supplement, The Times Higher Education Supplement, and The Chronicle of Higher Education most helpful in their coverage of recent English language policy decisions in all four case areas. The Canadian Modern Language Review is, not surprisingly, the main source for Canada, and German researchers publish with relative frequency in the English Language Teaching Journal. For Japan, I have found the Japan Quarterly an excellent source

for objective discussions of English language policy there, together with Wordell's A Guide to Teaching English in Japan (1985). For India, TESOL Quarterly and Khubchandani (1983) are most important. In addition, I have used a variety of other sources for background information. In the case of periodicals, my research procedure has been to review all pertinent entries since 1980.

There are no specific studies that have addressed the issue of the policy/attitude overlap in the precise parameters that I have selected in the four political entities I have chosen to survey. Political "entities" is the cover term I use for Japan, India, Quebec, and the two Germanies. Japan is obviously the most homogeneous, India the most pluralistic, Canada virtually bilingual and bicultural, and Germany culturally and linguistically unified, although arbitrarily divided politically. There is a vast amount of literature on general language policy in India and Canada, since this matter is one of national obsession in both countries; Japan and Germany have adequate data available. My conclusions will largely be inferential or based on opinions of scholars and not "scientific" (that is, based on statistical attitude analysis). The reason is simple: specific attitudinal surveys ("Does your government's language policy make you want to learn English?") are virtually nonexistant. Even though the four case areas under discussion here are all democracies in the broadest sense, some government ministers of education (in

Quebec, for example) do not encourage potentially critical attitude surveys or questionnaires. Indeed, one of the additional purposes of this thesis is to engender a healthy skepticism of official government pronouncements in the ESL instructor, based upon the inconsistencies that I shall call attention to in nations that are generally much better documented than most countries attracting ESL instructors.

It would indeed be unfair to expect concrete answers from investigations of an area of overlap of subdisciplines in sociolinguistics which have existed themselves only for around two decades. For example, for the purpose of this research, I shall consider Gardner's and Lambert's 1965 article on motivation of Anglophone Canadians to study French as the inception of attitudinal research. Their work, and much subsequent investigation inspired by it, demonstrated through statistical analysis what teachers have known instinctively for centuries: that motivation and positive attitude, in this case towards French, contribute significantly to successful learning of a foreign language. I shall accept as proven that attitude and motivation are of paramount importance, but I shall have occasion to cite other research advocating the primacy of instrumental over integrative motivation (Shaw, 1981). It would, in my view, be naive to generalize from one study (either that of Gardner and Lambert or that of Shaw) and conclude that the same motives are present among individuals in vastly different cultural and political settings.

Traditional sociolinguistics, as I term it, will provide the theoretical framework for much of the data on Canada and India. One of the criticisms of language policy in these two countries is that central planners at education ministries are often structural linguists or non-linguist bureaucrats whose decisions fail to take into account the sociolinguistic realities of language use, thus assuring popular discontent (Mackey, 1983).

Language planning also contributes substantially to this thesis. History is replete with language fanatics and ideologues, but true, deliberate language planning is a recent phenomenon. Planners concern themselves with the status of a language (in this case, English) vis-a-vis other languages. Using Cobarubbias' (1983) scheme of juridical status, English is a joint official (arguably also a regulatory official) language in India, a joint official/tolerated language in Quebec and a promoted language in Germany and Japan. The major factor that characterizes language planning in our four case studies is that planners in a democracy must "conform to language ideologies believed to be upheld by representative groups" (Cobarubbias, p. 63). The same author says the connection between language status and political ideology is the "most neglected" aspect of language planning (p. 63). In addition to status planning, bureaucrats also indulge in corpus planning (the most famous example is the Academie Francaise) and Daoust-Blais (1983, p. 226) cites what she calls "labour

market planning" in Quebec to describe the unique view the provincial government there has of the role of English. Despite much rhetoric, English in Quebec is seen widely as the language of the workplace--the language that "achieves economic status" for the worker (Mackey, 1983, p. 187). The same writer summarizes the concept of language status as follows (p. 174): "The status of a language depends therefore on the number of people using it, their relative wealth, their social cohesiveness, and the acceptance by others of their right to be different."

In recent years sociolinguists have coined and further refined useful terminology to describe the realities of English instruction and use far beyond the simple ESL/EFL distinction. Much of this work resulted from lengthy seminars held at the East/West Center in Hawaii in the 1970s (Smith, 1981). In two of my case areas, Canada and India, English is clearly an _intra_national language, whereas in Japan and Germany it is studied as an _inter_national language (Smith). This fact obviously results from history, since Canada and India are both former colonies of Britain. The other two case areas, Japan and Germany, have in common another historical bond: they were defeated and occupied by the United States in World War II and experienced a sudden, massive exposure to American English that has been sustained.

Unfortunately, sociolinguists do not always agree on terms, and this leads to some confusion. For example,

Fishman (1977) uses the term "Language of Wider Communication" (LWC) to describe English spoken around the world; the term is used in much the same way as lingua franca. LWC is preferable in many ways because it is semantically neutral, whereas the terms "second" or "foreign" might be somewhat pejorative. Judd (1981) uses the slightly modified term ELWC (English as Language of World Communication). Khubchandani (1983, p. 103), on the other hand, notes how the term "mother tongue" is difficult to pin down in pluralistic India: "The concept of mother tongue is closely linked with the awareness of one's identity affiliations on one's society." As a result, census figures in India are subject to "oscillation" and "have often been a source of tension affecting policy-making processes in many states" (p. 103). Khubchandani prefers the term "contact language" for both Hindi and English in India, since it too is descriptive yet neutral. Strevens (1980) uses the term "link language" for similar reasons. It is not the purpose of this thesis to sort out the domains of the different subfields of sociolinguistics, although they must obviously overlap. I shall merely appropriate useful terms and concepts from them in order to address the research question. However, it is useful to remind the reader that sociolinguists are at work describing the use of English in Canada and India, where it is spoken as a native language (whatever this means), whereas Japan and Germany offer more limited scope for such studies because English is

not native for the vast majority of the population (although in Germany a large percentage of people have some knowledge of it).

An examination of the teaching methodology used in English instruction in the different countries is also relevant to an investigation of the correlation between government policy and learner attitude and it has a place within the four-part flow chart of Strevens (1978). However, I shall deal with this problem only peripherally, since there is no assurance it will add to the definitiveness of my conclusions. Basically, a government's commitment to new research is a positive statement about its stress on developing positive learner attitudes, but I shall observe how there is often a gulf between theory and practice (for example in Japan, where teacher conservatism seems to contradict general popular enthusiasm). It is also clear that such things as teacher training and pay, curriculum design, and other factors all play a role either directly or indirectly in forming student attitudes, but as Fishman (1977) has pointed put, there is still no study of acquisition of English that tries to take into account the interaction of all such factors. One must attempt to relate all available scholarly opinions and other evidence to the central research question and leave the laborious task of constructing detailed language planning and attitude questionnaires to future scholars who somehow come upon vast financial resources. Fishman (p. 107) notes how, ideally,

"The study of language spread...must proceed not only from the manipulation and analysis of summary data at very great levels of abstraction but also from the observation of human behavior at first hand."

As mentioned above, this survey draws upon attitudinal research, language planning, and what I term "traditional" sociolinguistics. In my opinion, a healthy skepticism is appropriate when using data from all three. To cite one example: Canadians have pioneered attitude research and one would assume that language planners in Canada are very concerned with student attitudes. But appearances are deceiving; virtually all research has been done with Anglophones and their attitudes towards French. The Quebec provincial government, only recently secure in terms of the legally assured survival and propagation of French, seems loathe to allow attitudinal research among Francophones under its jurisdiction. One must read between the lines of the Canadian Modern Language Review (where most research has been published over the years) to find criticisms of federal or provincial policy, since vast amounts of grant money have flowed to scholars from government coffers. I shall also have reason to doubt the sincerity and motives of governments and their official pronouncements and figures. To what extent and for what political reasons does a policy only pay lip service to promoting English?

The field of language planning, since it translates (ideally) into curriculum decisions, is the subfield most

susceptible to prescriptive statements about language study. Obviously, when treating governments as diverse as those of India, Japan, Quebec, and the two Germanies, one must consider the degree to which any governmental agency can implement decisions. All commentators emphasize the highly centralized nature of Japan and East Germany, for example, the orderly federalism of West Germany, the provincial autarchy of Quebec, and the extreme complexity of India. Is it, however, logical to equate degree of centralization with degree of ability to influence learner attitudes positively? Are there other non-political variables which transcend all explicit bureaucratic decisions, no matter how authoritative?

Yet another barometer I find useful when inferring government attitudes towards English is the number of exchange students studying in an English-speaking country, since government approval at both ends is necessary. However, the affordability of education in the United States versus the United Kingdom, for example, is perhaps much more significant than a preference for the American system or American values. Statistical data from the UNESCO Statistical Yearbook (1986 ed.), though useful at times, do not take such factors as economics, student visa requirements, and xenophobia into account.

Finally, the researcher must also consider the level of pupils or students studying English in the areas under discussion. Conrad and Fishman (1977) point out how the

vast majority of those studying English are doing so at the primary and secondary levels. They cite UNESCO figures showing that around 75% of secondary students learn English; in Japan, for example, the figure is 100% (p. 20). Although the number of English-medium schools is decreasing worldwide, Cobarubbias and Fishman (1983, p. 25) feel this fact will not necessarily lessen the "knowledge of the language in wider communication," since much of the increase of English instruction at the secondary level is because of its function as a "library language" at the university level. Since I am primarily discussing learners at pre-adult levels, it is significant to consider whether government policy might have a greater effect on their attitudes than on those of adult learners of English.

I shall initially describe the English language policy of Quebec, since it is the area that is in my view most thoroughly documented. From there I shall move on to India, Germany, and Japan. The arrangement is not arbitrary: it is intended to represent a progression from familiar to unfamiliar, and simultaneously a progression from high percentage of English knowledge in the population to lower percentages. In each chapter I shall briefly summarize the historical framework of English instruction before I then review current research findings, scholarly opinion, and inferential data. In addition to addressing my research question, my hope is that the reader will have a better basis for grasping the complexity of language

instruction and for understanding why certain approaches are doomed to failure. In the concluding chapter, I shall summarize my findings and investigate the relative usefulness of Strevens' four-part model in all four case areas. My hope is that the ESL professional would then be in a much better position to judge the different factors influencing the possible effects of explicit official English language policy on individual motivation in any host country.

CHAPTER II

ENGLISH IN QUEBEC

As I mentioned in the introduction, it is especially instructive to begin this study of the effect of government English langugage policy on individual motivation with an overview of the situation in the Canadian province of Quebec. Many Americans have at least a passing knowledge of the language debate in Quebec based upon their own travel experiences there, whereas some scholars have pointed out a supposed parallel between the French/English debate in Canada and the Spanish/English debate in some regions of the United States. Mackey (1983), however, points out how such parallels are not entirely accurate because of the vastly different geographical and demographical positions of the two "second" languages. Even if it is simplistic to expect that study of Quebec will provide an exact replica of current and future language planning problems in the United States, I believe it can give some insight into the types of questions an ESL teacher needs to ask in situations where English has official or co-official status. My own view is that the factors affecting individual motivation to learn a language such as English are so complex that we should only expect broadly similar situations or instructive analogies

and by no means absolute laws.

It is also particularly appropriate to begin with Canada, since Canadian scholars such as Gardner and Lambert have provided much of the theoretical basis for attitudinal research and government policy. Canada is also a nation which has built up a labyrinth of language legislation and resulting bureaucracies at the federal, provincial, and local levels. From the outset, moreover, one must keep the following political fact in mind: provincial governments and ministries of education in Canada wield more power than do, for example, their counterparts in West Germany's states. In addition, in language policy as in every other field, one must ask what role political expediency plays in language-related decisions. In this chapter, I shall focus primarily on the policies towards English in Quebec, where the situation is well documented and at least vaguely familiar to some readers.

First of all, a few historical and geographical notes are appropriate. Quebec represents historically the British/French colonial conflict transplanted to the New World. Furthermore, Quebec occupies a very strategic geographical position and its economic strength as an exporter of raw materials and energy has emboldened it to take many language-related decisions in the last two decades. The province sits astride the St. Lawrence River, which has always been the jugular vein of North America. It was the realization of this politico-economic clout, plus

the charismatic "francophonie" of Rene Levesque, which led to conflict and--ultimately--compromise.

Central to the conflict was and is the status of English vis-a-vis French, a struggle that has its roots in colonial times. Mackey (1983, p. 179) notes how language policy-making in Canada has been "dominated by the historical concept of two founding peoples..." Importantly, and this is a point non-Canadians fail to realize, not all French speakers in Canada live in Quebec. In fact, there is an almost identical distribution of native French speakers in Ontario and English speakers in Quebec, the two most populous provinces, with minor French communities elsewhere as well (Mackey). (In this chapter I shall follow convention and use the term "Quebecois" to mean French-speaking occupant of Quebec, but I shall use the anglicized form "Quebecker" to refer to all inhabitants, regardless of mother tongue.) This demographic balance has probably blunted language policy extremists somewhat, although, as Fishman (1983, p. 107) explains, some Anglophone language planners in Canada are "convinced that the Office de la Langue Francaise is not only riding the wicked crest of Quebecois nationalism toward 'francization,' but that it is arrogantly trying to change, improve, and modernize the French language even above and beyond Parisian splendor." A Quebec scholar points out that sensitivity to the predominance of English in North America has until recently been exacerbated by misgivings among some Francophones about

the quality of provincial Quebec French (Daoust-Blais, 1983). The same author sees the language conflict (and thus attitudes towards English) and the resulting legislation as manifestations of the Francophone population's "self-assertion" (p. 229).

Before detailing current attitudes towards English, I shall briefly summarize significant political, social, and economic trends of the last two decades that have led to the current state of affairs. Schecter (1980) explains how there was no need for language legislation in Quebec until the 1960s, because French speakers were basically rural and had little contact with urbanized Anglophones. This all changed, however, as Quebec industrialized and became a major exporter of hydroelectric power. With growing industrial change and immigration both from overseas and from within Canada, the Quebecois became concerned about their falling birthrate and disintegrating cultural identity; there was a growing perception that they were being overwhelmed (Mackey). Indeed, one could maintain that the Quebec siege mentality is partially a provincial manifestation of the general Canadian unease about subjugation by the United States.

One notes in Quebec two parallel, and on the surface contradictory, trends in the language policy of the last two decades. On the one hand, as a result of industrialization, "Knowledge of English is felt to be an essential asset by the majority of the subjects, who feel that English is still

essential in the workfield in Quebec (Daoust-Blais, p. 215). This is a sort of "blue-collar pragmatism" or an indication of classic instrumental motivation. Mackey (1983, p. 187) notes how "Quebec's language policy stresses language of the workplace, since that is what achieves economic status." On the other hand, excessive political rhetoric (associated with de Gaulle's controversial visit, Levesque's move towards secession, and acts of both language-inspired terrorism and pettiness) has resulted in massive government interference at the legislative and bureaucratic level. Most Americans have experienced this only in terms of monolingual streetsigns, but the provincial goverment has even required that businesses obtain "francization certificates" to prove that employees can work in French (Daoust-Blais). In addition, the Quebec provincial government has taken on the role of the Catholic Church as guarantor of the province's cultural heritage by encouraging local French writing (Mackey).

Ironically, it was the prospect of the possible secession of Quebec and of a divided Canada that led to Ottawa's passing the Offical Languages Act of 1969 and the Federal Language Charter of 1977. This same nervousness was also at least partially responsible for the research of Gardner and Lambert and their associates, but this scholarship deals almost entirely with _Francophone_ attitudes towards _Anglophones_, especially in Ontario. Indeed, after two decades of research, one has the distinct impression

that English-speaking pupils must be weary of being "immersed," "submerged," studied, and questioned. The literature is almost entirely one-sided: I found only one very general source (Gagnon, 1974) dealing with Francophone attitudes towards English. There are several possible explantions for this phenomenon. First of all, the Quebec government has been very hesitant to seem to compromise at a time when the national government was still willing to make concessions to the French language. Secondly, it seems the Quebec Minister of Education in Montreal, who would ultimately have to approve extensive attitudinal research in the classroom, has been traditionally hesitant to allow documentation of the obvious--that there is grassroots recognition of the need to know some English if the Quebec economy is to remain an aggresive exporter. In addition, there is also the "spoiler factor"--the notion that Quebec could be to the rest of Canada what France has been to NATO.

The two most significant pieces of federal legislation were the Offical Languages Act (1969) and the Federal Language Charter (1977) (Mackey, 1983). These two acts were meant to mollify Quebecois separatists by stating explicitly that French and English were co-official languages throughout Canada, but Fishman (1983) believes they also reflected pan-Canadian consensus that all citizens had the right to deal with any government agency in their own native language. Basically, the government in Ottawa wanted to send the following message to Montreal: we are willing to go to

great expense nationwide to show good faith and a sense of fair play if you are willing to work constructively with us. After two centuries of minor legal struggles within Quebec, French-speakers had won official nation-wide status and all Canadians had the right to have their children educated in the language of their choice, given sufficient numbers within a school district.. Canada thus embarked upon a costly official policy of biculturalism and bilingualism. This was a boon for linguists, since massive language training for the military and civil service began.

More importantly, school administrators (except in Quebec) began to experiment with various schemes for language instruction at the primary and secondary level, even in areas where there was little integrative motivation or few Francophones. Not surprisingly, many Canadian linguists have been hesitant to criticize such largesse. An exception is Mackey, who describes (1983, p. 202) how "Each year the Federal Commissioner of Official Languages publishes a book recounting the many failures of the federal bureaucracy to create the bilingual utopia." He adds that these reports are "the most unconventional and amusing official documents ever penned by a federal bureaucrat" (p. 202). Mackey relates the actual case of a lifeguard in western Canada who did nothing as a French-speaker screamed for help and drowned. When asked to explain his actions, he replied that he had qualified for the job because he was bilingual, but that no one had asked him if he could swim!

The second major national language act did not come soon enough for the Parti Quebecois. In 1976 it won control of the government of Quebec, and there ensued new language bills (at the provincial level) each year, the most radical of which was Bill 101 in 1977 (Mackey, 1983). Canadian historian Ian Frazer (1987) feels that this piece of legislation was Levesque's major achievement: French was proclaimed the sole official language and the children of immigrants from both other provinces and foreign countries had to study in French. This law has been the focus of major legal disputes and election battles at the school board level, especially in Montreal, since native Anglophone parents still have the right to send their children to English-medium schools. However, as Nelson and Rebuffot (1984, p. 362) point out, there is an obvious contradiction: "Canada is officially a bilingual country with the rights of both English speakers and French speakers assured by act of Canadian Parliament. Quebec, however, is officially a monolingual province." The political situation is equally complex, since Quebeckers will cross party lines in federal elections, although they usually vote along linguistic lines in provincial ones (Nelson & Rebuffot). At least part of the difficulty is semantic, since the Quebec government has chosen to interpret the word "official" in a very broad sense.

Despite the fact that Bill 101 led to polarization of language communities and official provincial encouragement

of French at the expense of English and all of its effects are not yet clear, Nelson and Rebuffot claim (1984) it has allayed Francophone fears of the imminent collapse of French. For example, the independence resolution was defeated in 1980 and Levesque fell from grace. However, Schecter (1983) claims that all the legal parameters will have to be worked out in the courts before some Francophones will willingly speak English. The problem is made even more complex by the fact that Montreal with its ethnic neighborhoods is not at all representative of the province as a whole. In the meanwhile, the Quebec administration must grudgingly admit the necessity of English; despite the rhetoric of francophonie, Quebeckers as a whole recognize the following scale of communication priorities: (1) the rest of Canada (2) the United States (3) the Common Market countries (4) France (Schecter).

This brings us to a significant debate: what exactly should the status of English in Quebec be--EFL, ESL, or LWC? Strevens (1980) implies that English in Quebec is best considered a second language because of lingering resentment. The distinction is important, since, as Judd (1983, p. 63) reminds us again, "Instructional programs that are compatible with the socio-political situations in which they are located are more likely to succeed, while those that are in conflict with the English language policy of a given country run a greater chance of failure." The notion that individuals might be more willing to learn English if

it has a less offensive legal status is something akin to a placebo effect. Indeed, sociolinguists feel it is important to keep motivation high by recognizing individual student goals and reasons for English study. I have coined the term "blue-collar pragmatism" to describe this situation in Quebec.

Such pragmatism is evidenced by the fact that Quebec's three English-medium universities are attracting a higher percentage of motivated Francophones, to the degree that the provincial government is worried about the role and status of the three institutions. Some view the schools as a threat to French-speaking universities, while others reason the three provide a "valuable bridge" between Quebec and the rest of North America (Gerson, 1983, p. 22). There probably also exists a (largely unexpressed) fear among some Quebecois that the English-medium schools are somehow considered superior.

The battle to classify Quebec (especially Montreal) schools as French or English is still being fought bitterly by parents at the "PTA" level in metropolitan areas with mixed populations (McLean, 1985), but there is some evidence that an "anglo-Quebec" identity is developing that is separate from an anglo-Canadian one (Hamers, 1984). While Anglophone pupils outside Quebec are dutifully immersed or submerged in French and subsequently interrogated about their attitudes to it all, there continues to be little inter-provincial cooperation at the ministry level (Stern,

1982). Here one must keep in mind that the two most populous provinces (Quebec and Ontario) are neighbors, although it is easier to grasp why English speakers in British Columbia, for example, could feel less affected by the language debate or less enthusiastic about working with a Francophone education minister on the side of North America.

There is also evidence of a significant change of approach emanating from Montreal: Quebec's ministry of education is encouraging interregional and intraregional exchanges of students, especially summer programs, in an effort to foster positive attitudes between the two main language groups. According to Hamers (1984), the ministry feels these exchanges will lead to understanding, encourage language study, and even re-inforce ethnic identity positively. Perhaps one can interpret this as disillusionment with complex bureaucratic solutions, the quota mentality, and the excessive legalism of previous years. Such exchanges may also reflect the growing acceptance of a communicative approach to language-learning.

In conclusion, this case study represents a well-documented example of how government policy can positively affect individual motivation to learn English, at least to a certain extent. After an era of conflict in the 1960s and 1970s when the Quebec provincial government felt it was in danger of being overwhelmed by the English language from all sides, it has gained confidence as a result of its exports.

Also, despite some cynicism and criticism of the Canadian government's massive (and expensive) commitment to bilingualism, there is good evidence that the conciliatory tone of the national authorities has partially defused the language debate. Now there are sound economic reasons for the bureaucrats in Montreal to modestly promote English. There is also the possibility that Canadians as a whole will in coming years become increasingly worried about their relations with the United States and more resigned to a working relationship among Anglophones and Francophones. It will also be interesting to observe what possible effects future trade conflicts with the United States and rising Canadian nationalism resulting from the recent Olympics in Calgary will have on Canadian resolve to reach a linguistic consensus.

In terms of analogies between Quebec and other places in the world, perhaps the most obvious thing is that one must seriously question the political motives which often lurk behind officially promoted scholarship. Another point is that one must consider the degree of political balance represented by the major languages of a country, and the extent to which English as an SL or FL can upset or enhance the balance. Together with this, one must look carefully at the balance of political power within a country, if it is a democracy, to determine the extent to which a regional or state government is willing to work with a national education ministry. Finally, the case study of Quebec

reminds us that attitudes can change quickly, given the explosive potential of political rhetoric and rapid economic change.

CHAPTER III

ENGLISH IN PLURALISTIC INDIA

Both Canada and India are former British colonies, but whereas the former is basically a bilingual/bicultural balance despite her immense size, India is characterized by what Khubchandani (1983) in the title of his book terms "plural languages" and "plural cultures." Although Canada's demographic and linguistic shifts have led to some political readjustment in recent years, there is in India an exceedingly complex pattern of shifting language loyalties and even the official Gazetteer of India (Chopra, 1973, p. 733) admits: "It is perhaps better to describe India as a land of minorities in which the majority itself is fluctuating and differs in shape, size, and text according to the principle of organization we may seek."

After a brief survey of the historical and political circumstances that have determined the status of English in India, I shall describe the degree to which government policy attempts to affect individual motivation. Although the situation in India is admittedly more complex than in most developing countries, it still furnishes the researcher with an example of how language status, politics, and motivation are often inextricably bound together, even if

there is not always a clear cause and effect relationship. India also demonstrates the need for the ESL instructor to have a basic grasp of the history of institutions and major political conflicts in the host country, even though the experts may disagree among themselves about the finer points. Finally, I feel that the situation of English in India could offer parallels with other former British colonies in Asia and Africa where there is less information. India itself does not represent a market for ESL or EFL instructors from abroad, since the country would obviously rather employ its own English-speakers. Indeed, India has reason to fear a "brain drain" of its gifted scholars. I still feel, however, that an ESL instructor can profitably study India, particularly because of the whole issue of the status of the English language in education and administration.

It is unnecessary for the purposes of this chapter to summarize Britain's gradual conquest of India; however, it is inaccurate to view English simplistically as a language of "military imposition" (Fishman, 1977, p. 125). The first English-medium mission school was opened in 1717 (Chopra, 1973) and official encouragement to learn English to gain entry to the civil service began in the 1830s under Lord Bentinck (Spear, 1981). English was destined to replace Persian as the language of administration in the north and now it is involved in a complementary or competatory relationship--depending on one's point of view--with Hindi.

Thus the status and function of English in India are far more complex than are those of French in Canada. Indeed, the very complexity of the situation in India probably results in decreased government ability to manipulate motivation. Because of shifting language loyalties and religious differences it is extremely unlikely that there will develop two equally strong camps (as in Canada) that are willing to resolve their differences.

At this point a digression is in order. Although there is no debate in Quebec as to *which* English to promote (the question is rather *why* or *whether*), in India there are differing views--one basically prescriptive and the other descriptive, about which variety of English to promote officially. Following Kachru (1976, p. 236), one might also call these two standpoints "purist" and "realist." The prescriptivists/purists are concerned with the "decline" of English in India; Nagarajan (1981), for example, compares English in India to a sacred cow, and says it has been in decline since the introduction in 1857 of a literary syllabus for university studies. He claims that, paradoxically, this decline of English was "related to the neglect of the vernacular languages" (p. 668), since no one language could be given adequate encouragement. Another prescriptivist, Clifford Prator, stresses the need for international intelligibility and the undesirability of "nativization" (1968, p. 459), but his views have been severely criticized by one of the leading proponents of the

descriptivist (sociolinguistic) approach--Braj Kachru. Kachru (1976, p. 229) stresses the "pragmatics" of all Third World "Englishes": the role of English in India is "primarily as an Indianized link language for functions in culture and society..." much like Persian and Sanskrit in the past. Another prominent Indian scholar who espouses a similar position is Khubchandani (1983). It is important to keep this (albeit oversimplified) dichotomy in mind because, as Fishman (1983) points out, language planning decisions at the national level have often been made by structural linguists and not by sociolinguists; such individuals are more likely to be corpus planners who are insensitive to language use. Indeed, this debate (often referred to as the "language question") is one of the stumbling blocks for government English policy in India. Khubchandani believes that much language planning by the "Hindi particularist elite" (p. 61) ignores what he terms the traditional "grassroots multilingualism" (p. 66) that has always been characteristic of the Indian masses.

Despite its later independence from Britain, India preceded Canada by more than two decades in giving two languages--Hindi and English--official national status. The original Indian constitution specified that English be retained for all official purposes until 1965, but in 1963 the Official Languages Act stated that "English may continue to be used in addition to Hindi, for all official purposes of the union..." (India: A Reference Manual, 1981, p. 19).

intricate rules and guidelines to regulate language use in government and business (somewhat similar to the concept of "francization certificates" in Quebec) and the government also promotes "enrichment" of Hindi vocabulary through the finalization of new terms (p. 53), but India is even less able to implement such measures on a national scale than is the government of Quebec.

Of India's first generation of leaders it was Jawaharlal Nehru who most often addressed the language issue. Nehru advocated "the growth of our great provincial languages," although he also recognized the need for an "all-India language" (Gopah, 1980, p. 517). But he emphatically stated: "This cannot be English or any other [foreign] language, although...English is bound to play an important part in our future activities" (p. 517). Nehru subscribed to a language ideology that Cobarubbias (1983, p. 71) terms "internationalization": he wanted to keep English as India's "window on the world" at the international level, but at the same time carefully prescribe its use at the national level. He explicitly hoped to avoid a "new caste system" of English-speakers and he said of Hindi (somewhat ironically, from the present perspective, in view of government promotion of Hindi): "A language will grow ultimately because of its inherent worth and not because of statutes or resolutions" (Gopah, p. 519). It is fair to ask to what degree a highly educated man like Nehru actually believed such statements and to what degree they were meant

to satisfy nascent Indian nationalism.

In fact, despite the logic or legislation in favor of Hindi, there is widespread resentment towards the mandatory imposition of it in the south of India, whereas English has lost most of its colonial stigma throughout the whole of India (Kachru, 1983). As Khubchandani (1983) notes, this is the ultimate fallacy of having a language planning elite (whether well-intentioned or otherwise) simplistically prescribing the behavior of the masses. Furthermore, in complex and volatile democracies like India, one must always take into account the short-term political expediency that underlies many language planning decisions. "In spite of the policymakers' revolutionary pronouncements regarding a change in language functions to accord with national aspirations, the powerful elite in India does not seem to be very enthusiastic about the switchover from English to indigenous languages" (Khubchandani, p. 67). Larry Smith (1981, p. 20) summarizes this interminable language crossfire as follows: "The discussion in favour of Hindi and regional languages, or in favour of the continuation of English, is an on-going debate which provides both entertainment for people and an issue for politicians. In the meantime, English has the upper hand." One is reminded of the situation in Canada, where language bureaucrats have created mountains of reports and studies, often resulting in some cynicism on the part of taxpayers.

Obviously, the rank and file of any nation cannot wait

to communicate until politicians have resolved all language use issues. In this same regard, Conrad and Fishman (1977, p. 55) explain how "a second language will be learned if and only if the presumptive learner estimates the advantages of knowing that language to be higher than the cost..." Sociolinguists familiar with the complex situation in India agree that Gardner's and Lambert's notion of integrative motivation does not fit: a study of 900 Indian university students and teachers of English conducted by Prator in 1974 showed that 65.54% had only "occasional interaction with native speakers," whereas 11.79% had none at all (Kachru, 1976, p. 233). Kachru proposes a "pragmatic profile" to understand the function of English (i.e. Who do English-speaking Indians interact with? The answer: mostly with each other.) He also explains how the same 900 Indians recognized up to ten different varieties of Indian English and he argues for the appropriateness of the "Indianness" of English as a whole. Khubchandani (1983), although he would agree with this pragamatic, non-elitist view, nevertheless takes more of a language planner's perspective and advocates promoting "gradual stabilization of a pan-regional standard" (p. 80). As mass communications make more inroads into traditional Indian society this will probably become more of a reality.

It is clear that an integrative motive that would fit the context of Montreal, for example, is clearly not present in India. In fact, the classic notion of integrative

motivation is less and less appropriate in most contexts and it probably results from an overly sentimental view that English instructors have about the reasons for the importance of their native tongue. One must recall what Kachru (1976, p. 225) calls one of the "seven attitudinal sins": forgetting that non-native varieties of English are "culture-bound codes of communication and not vehicles "meant to introduce British or American culture." At what point then does a language become "native"? Khubchandani (1983) recognizes this dilemma when he argues that India should slowly promote a regional standard English to facilitate the nativization of English and overcome the schizophrenic colonial dichotomy between a language of privilege and vernacular languages. The problem in India, unlike Canada, is that English is not associated exclusively with a particular state or region and that different registers of it are spoken throughout the nation. (In Canada, a Quebecois can actually look across the river at predominately English-speaking Ontario and the federal capital of Ottawa.) The result is that there is no clear, uniform consensus in India as to the status of English (FL, SL, LWC), despite an explicit official status.

India shares with Canada a federal-style government which leaves much of the implementation of language policy to state governments (Khubchandani, 1983, p. 69). Since the establishment of the "Three Language Formula" in 1956, which provides for primary instruction in the native tongue and

English by secondary school, there has been a huge increase in English instruction, albeit mostly due to the post-war population explosion (Khubchandani). Due to India's immense diversity and lack of data, there are few generalizations one can make about the quality of secondary school English instruction, although Khubchandani maintains that despite demographic shifts there is strong motivation to learn English, but with a change from imitation of style of native speakers towards "fragmented utilitarian usage" (p. 78). Furthermore, the same scholar feels the masses in general are not as disenchanted with English as are some elites, even though there are some states that might show particular hostility to English as a result of "Indian language chauvinism" (pp. 78-79). Khubchandani also believes that part of the political controversy about English can be explained in terms of an established national elite competing with a rising local elite. That is to say, a provincial politician without the benefit of an elite British education finds it easy and politically profitable to attack the views of Rajiv Gandhi on the role of English.

Over ten years ago, Conrad and Fishman (1977) noted a world-wide trend away from English-medium secondary schools, but they feel this fact need not lessen the "knowledge of the language in wider communication" (p. 25). The two scholars believe this same trend in India represents a transitional phase and the way "toward a policy through which the vernacular languages may be developed in a context

of greater utilization of the language of wider communication" (p. 25).

Due to increased documentation, the situation at the university level becomes much clearer as regards motivation to learn English. Kachru (1976) cites Prator's 1974 study to illustrate how academics (66.66% of 900) preferred British English as a model even though they had little clear integrative motivation. Smith (1981, p. 26) points out that only a very small group of Indians use English for international communication and he cautiously cites statistics claiming that only 3% (18 million) of all Indians are English-speaking bilinguals. Furthermore, he maintains that the attitudes of these native speakers towards English tend to be more protective and purist the more educated they are.

A second study that sheds light on the motivation of university students was conducted by Willard D. Shaw (1981) at Osmania University in Hyderabad. Since a detailed attitudinal survey is a rarity, his conclusions will be summarized in some detail. They should be used with caution, however: the fact that Shaw intentionally chose to survey university students in a city between the Hindi north and the Dravidian south means that his data is clearly representative only of a transitional language zone (although this point could be argued many different ways). The five most popular reasons for studying English were tabulated as follows: (1) for my work (94%); (2) to

converse with native speakers for job reasons (74%); (3) to speak with other foreigners (66%); (4) because it is required (80%); and (5) because it makes me a better person (71%) (p. 110). Shaw found the following were the least popular reasons for studying English: (1) because I like countries where English is spoken (33%); (2) because I like native speakers (30%); (3) because I plan to travel there (16%); (4) It will help me behave as native speakers. (29%) (p. 109). Shaw concluded the students all showed "preference for the utilitarian uses of English" and that any integrative element could be understood only in terms of a desire to identify with the elite in India (pp. 112, 117).

Despite the fact that most Indians see British English as a standard, the "nativization" of English in Indian has a strong instrumental function, since the language is dominant in eighty-three universities and is used extensively in nineteen others (Smith, 1981). Smith adds: "It is primarily through textbooks in English that attempts are being made towards imparting what Indians call _all-Indian awareness_, and consciousness of the underlying cultural unity of the country" (p. 20). English has an obvious advantage for scientific research as well. In fact, even at the primary and secondary level it is important to understand the government's role in textbook production and printing in general. Lieven (1984) notes how there is a general lack of vernacular texts and Nath (1986) adds that texts in general are dull because of the government's near

monopoly of textbook production. Indian publishing has, in fact, moved beyond the captive domestic market and is now the world's third largest publisher of books in English. Even though many of these are for export to the Third World, it is inevitable that the increased availability of English books, especially school texts, should further cement the domestic position of English in education, despite pockets of resistance (Lieven). Lieven commments on the motivation to read English: "Its hold is guaranteed by the refusal of non-Hindi speaking areas to accept Hindi as a substitute national language (modern literary Hindi is to some extent an artificial creature of the late nineteenth century) and of course by its prestige as the principal international language" (p. 9). Fishman has carefully tabulated the prominence of English in radio and newspapers for similar motives.

The obvious motivation to learn English transcends the shortcomings of university English instruction that often derive from fossilized Victorian views about pedagogy (Nagarajan, 1981). There are a few who see a partial solution to the further entrenchment of stilted literary prose in the encouragement of modern Indian literature in English, since it alone can reflect "the experiences of a nation struggling to remake itself" and "serve as an eloquent medium of expression of true identity in a free country and an independant world (Couto, 1982, p. 9).

A year before her death, Indira Gandhi joined the ranks

of the prescriptivists to halt the "decline" of English instruction in schools and universities and asked provincial governments to set up remedial courses because many undergraduates could not understand lectures in the scientific field (Abraham, 1983). But in this case, as with other attempts to de-centralize or co-ordinate between federal and state ministries, politicians ran afoul of funding difficulties. A more recent goal is the attempt of the present prime minister, Rajiv Gandhi, to establish a more uniform national curriculum as regards English instruction, but this too is extremely difficult to fund or to implement, since it would place great burdens on teachers and pupils alike. Children would have to demonstrate proficiency in one language before moving on to another at a higher level (Fletcher, 1986). It is not surprising, given the lack of clear goals, regional squabbling, and lack of funds, that private English-medium primary and pre-primary schools have been reported to be "mushrooming" all over India, despite higher fees and the threat of discontinuation of government support (Abraham, 1985).

As I have mentioned above, there are some similarities in the government's promotion of English in India and Francophone Canada, the major difference being that English in India does not have a specific territorial association. This is significant, since it led to early hopes that English could somehow be encouraged for communication with the outside world, whereas Hindi (and the elite

associated with it) could somehow be victorious on the home front. This thinking is a manifestation of elitist status and corpus planning and violates the principles of "grassroots multilingualism" (Khubchandani, 1983, p. 66) which has always been the norm in India. Furthermore, the whole debate about the degree of government encouragement of English and at which level can only be understood in terms of the maze of Indian politics at all levels.

In terms of the purpose of this thesis, India furnishes the ESL teacher with several instructive points to ponder over. First of all, it is very unlikely in an extremely complex, pluralistic society like India that overt government language policy can have much of an immediate impact, although in the long run it can help entrench those individuals who benefit directly from it by retaining power and privilege. Secondly, those nations, such as India, with a colonial past will have many varieties of English and an instructor must be extremely flexible and non-judgmental. Often speakers of a variety of English may feel uneasy about their language, just as Daoust-Blais (1983) feels that the Quebecois have often been defensive about their French. Thirdly, despite fossilized remnants of Western culture, learners of English in an environment such as India may have very little integrative motivation to learn English, for reasons of culture, nationalism, or simply expense.

CHAPTER IV

ENGLISH IN THE TWO GERMAN STATES

As I explained in the introduction, I consider Germany a cultural entity, although it consists of two distinct political units. Since the two German states are so vastly different, they form a stark contrast in terms of official attitudes towards English and the resulting--largely inferred--motivation of students. I have a special in-depth knowledge of and interest in both the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR), having spent five years in West Berlin. For two of those five years I worked as translator for a West German organization that published a monthly newsletter monitoring the human rights situation in Eastern Europe.

Val D. Rust, author of the annotated bibliography _Education in East and West Germany_ (1984), notes that there is much information on education in general in the FRG, although "a dearth of material exists on the German Democratic Republic..." (p. IX). As for references to English instruction at the policy-making level, there are a fair number of entries for the FRG in Rust's bibliography and very few indeed for the GDR. There are no attitudinal surveys as such about government policy in either state. My

personal opinion is that English instruction is so ingrained in the West German (and northern European) educational system that no one ever questions publicly its necessity or desirability. In the GDR, on the other hand, few people question anything publicly.

In the following pages, I shall briefly sketch the history of English instruction in the two Germanies and summarize recent policy decisions. I shall also explain the status of English in both nations and infer to what degree students at all levels are motivated or not motivated to learn the language.

At first, a comment on the basic political nature of the two states: the GDR is by far the most centralized of all the entities under study in this thesis (far more so even than Japan, since the GDR is a small, one-party state); the FRG, on the other hand is the most clearly "federal." Although individual West German states (Länder) can set their own policies, to a large extent they follow the lead of the national government (Max Planck Institute, 1979). The Federal Republic has dialectal and religious differences, but nothing comparable to the bilingual, bicultural system of Canada.

Any student of European history is aware that English has been a high-profile language in Germany for centuries; English literature has influenced German writers and there have been substantial cultural, economic, and dynastic contacts. The watershed for English, however, was the

Allied victory and occupation after World War II. According to the most detailed study of German education, the FRG was increasingly subjected to the philosophy of American "mass education," whereas its traditional emphasis had been more on "class education" (that is, keeping a smaller proportion of pupils in school in preparation for university work) (Max Planck Institute, 1979, p. XV). The growth of the West German middle class in the 1950s and the 1960s, however, greatly changed the extent and nature of secondary education and thus of language instruction.

The educational system in the Soviet zone of occupation, which came to be the GDR, began to develop along lines radically different from West Germany from the very beginning of the post-war era. Whereas the FRG still drew upon German tradition, the GDR turned towards Soviet-style socialist education, central control, and uniformity (Max Planck Institute, 1979). To a large extent, this was inevitable, since the Soviet zone was in a state of ruin after the war and almost eighty percent of the old teaching staff were either casualties or politically unacceptable (Childs, 1983). In short, there would have been little continuity, even had the Soviets allowed it. Thus began, with Russian aid, the heavily vocational system still in place, whose role it was to break class barriers and bridge the gap between urban and rural schools (Childs).

Does such a polytechnical system encourage English instruction? Yes, to a very limited extent, although

Russian is, not surprisingly, the mandatory first foreign language. Russian instruction, which became mandatory in 1951, peaks in grade six (five hours a week), and continues on through the university (Childs, 1983; Rust, 1984). The East German system, aside from devoting much time to Marxism-Leninism, sport training, and paramilitary training, also devotes considerable classtime to Russian, for reasons of outward political solidarity. Two relatively recent British observers of GDR Russian classes (Sutherland, 1981; Lang, 1981) have noted that the atmosphere in the language classroom was one of boredom and lack of enthusiasm. In fact, in 1981, the national teacher newspaper, although it maintained that teachers should use the study of Russian "to develop friendly ties with Lenin's land," conceded that instruction often failed to do that (Lang, p. 15e). Based upon my own conversations with East Germans, there is very little integrative motivation to learn Russian, although there are some 250,000 Russians in the GDR. Once, when I was on a train to Prague, I asked an East German reservist if local girls ever married Russian soldiers like some German girls still occasionally do American soldiers stationed in West Germany. He replied incredulously: "What? Those poor devils can never even leave their bases!" Although the East German media make much of solidarity with the Soviet Union and friendship with its people, there is very little desire among East Germans as a whole to polish up their conversational Russian with a Russian infantryman.

That is to say, integrative motivation as such does not exist. The very fact that Russian is mandatory at the university level is a tacit admission that previous study has been unsuccessful.

The time spent on Russian means less time for English. One of the same English observers cited above has noted how English instruction, which begins at the secondary school level, was boring; lessons consisted largely of choral reading. "This was typical of the lack of curiosity about the West which we found, and the willingness to accept party propaganda platitudes about it" (Sutherland, 1981, p. 19b). Instruction in English, or another modern language, continues into the university, where students still lead a highly regimented existence, their majors determined by government needs (von Ow, 1985). Nonetheless, I still believe that there is some interest among students in learning English and I have had encounters with East Germans who attempted somewhat bashfully to practice their skills with me, although I speak fluent German.

There is no information available on teaching methods used with Russian and English at the university level and the fact that both are taught should not necessarily be construed to mean that they are considered equals. It is also impossible to measure relative levels of proficiency in the two languages among East German university students, although it is safe to assume that both languages are most useful as research languages to enhance the GDR's standing

as an industrial power.

Admittedly, the GDR is in an anomalous situation and the lack of information is tantalizing as regards the motivation of students to learn English or their attitudes to English speakers. In my own experience appearances are sometimes deceiving. Despite the very bleak picture painted of the United States in the GDR media, most East Germans, even outwardly apathetic ones, have access to Western media (to include British and American television and radio emanating from West Berlin, VOA, and the BBC) and many "feel sickened at the hypocrisy which surrounds everything to do with the Soviet Union" (Childs, 1983, p. 317). Although the GDR is a world-class industrial power, most of its trade has taken place with West Germany in recent years and it is unclear to what extent it would be interested in increased trade with non-Warsaw Pact nations--a trend that might require use of English as a language of wider communication. In any case, it will probably not follow the recent pragmatic course of the Czechs, who have done much to modernize the national English syllabus along communicative lines (Repka, 1986), nor would it ever conceivably dethrone Russian in favor of English as the first foreign language, as the student branch of Solidarity did briefly in Poland before the imposition of martial law.

Having summarized the scant information available on the instruction of Russian and English in the GDR, I shall now return to the FRG, where the status of English is

clearly different. Whereas Russian is an imposed language of conquest and an aspiring LWC throughout Eastern Europe, English at least began partly in the same way but has evolved far beyond that, fostered by both instrumental and integrative motivation and, arguably, some social group identification. The UNESCO Statistical Yearbook (1986 ed.) provides some figures to show the relative importance the two Germanies attach to study abroad in the United States. Whereas there were only 31 GDR students in the United States in 1984, there were 3,579 West Germans (In the same year 3,880 American students were at West German universities and none in the GDR.) Although one must be careful in drawing conclusions from statistics alone, since they do not take economics into account, there is broad consistency between the GDR's timid promotion of English and its unwillingness to send a significant number of students to the United States. West Germany, on the other hand, sends large numbers of students to the United States, although its school system is arguably superior to America's.

The general philosophy of the FRG towards foreign languages can be traced to a program for educational reform published as a model for all of occupied Germany by the Allied Control Council of Berlin on June 24, 1947 (The Soviets soon diverged considerably.): "All school curricula should aim to promote understanding of and respect for other nations, and to this end attention should be given to the study of modern languages, without preference for any

language" (Rust, 1984, p. XXIV). In reality, preference has been given to English in the FRG, but the general theme continues to be language study for Völkerverständigung (understanding among nations). A 1970 resolution of the FRG's Council of Education stated that children should be drawn out of ethnocentric views and "encouraged to develop an open-minded attitude towards other people and ways of life...(Gompf, 1986, p. 5). A policy originally resulting from military conquest, de-nazification, and national shame has subsequently developed as a result of integrative and instrumental motivation on a national scale. West Germany, as a member of NATO, works closely with both the UK and USA and is the cornerstone of the EEC. All of these activities presuppose a positive government policy towards English, which is precisely what the literature indicates. The FRG has actively supported the Council of Europe's research on communicative language teaching--in stark contrast with the GDR's largely undocumented stance on English instruction.

During the tenure of Helmut Schmidt in Bonn the world grew accustomed to accent-free English and I recall the press making much of the fact that Schmidt and D'Estaing spoke English during their regular summits. Conversely, the present chancellor, Helmut Kohl, is a source of some embarrassment among cosmopolitan Germans because his English is very limited. In fact, English in West Germany has become a language of wider communication within Europe and with the rest of the world, and it is less and less

associated exclusively with the United States or Britain. In fact, some of the harshest critics of American policies are those whose command of English is the best. It is a profound mistake to conclude that degree of outward "Americanization" translates into support for American or British policies, which is precisely the impression many casual American visitors gain. A recent book excerpted in the German magazine Stern (Krauer, 1987) entitled Lieben Wir die Amis? (Do We Love the Americans?) underscores an important recent trend: West Germans are increasingly skeptical about the value of American culture and policies, although this does not manifest itself in doubts about the utility of the English language. In the Stern article, Krauer describes how 63% of Germans polled thought their own culture superior to American culture, and 59% felt German literature was superior. Importantly, no question was asked about the English language per se. I feel this trend does not represent a revival of German nationalism, but rather a decline in German respect for America. As Krauer (p. 84) puts it: "The German orphan has grown up in the meantime and the much-prized gifts of the adoptive parents--among them weapons--are no longer to his taste. We are not anti-American but un-American."

In my opinion there are two major trends in West German society which account for the sustained popularity of English, but in both cases these trends have reached a mature phase and are no longer directly dependent on the

USA. Significantly, this development is occurring when the generations who experienced extensive direct contact are passing from the scene. Germans--both intellectuals and soldiers' wives--who came to the United States as a result of World War II or the American occupation are dying out and relations between the two states are less dependent on ties of blood and emotions (Max Planck Institute, 1983). The first trend is that English is seen at the intra-European and international level as an alternative to German, which is still emotionally charged in some parts of Europe. Thus English is a growing LWC less dependent on rejuvenation from the USA and more important within the EEC. Secondly, as a result of changes in the German university system, there is a "trickle down" effect which encourages study of English at an ever younger age: liberal "mass" universities have produced thousands of English majors and there is much pressure to broaden English instruction in order to create employment for them.

I have already alluded to the first trend--the legal status of English within the EEC and the Council of Europe's bureaucracy. The Council of Europe has encouraged extensive research in recent years in the area of communicative language teaching and standardized syllabus design (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Of course, this research applies to other languages as well, and the Council of Europe has dealt extensively with protecting regional languages. That is not to say that there is not resentment of the dominant role of

English within the EEC, for there are those who, quite correctly, see the language as a vestige of British colonialism and American cultural imperialism (Deth, 1985), but many Europeans who have not overcome strong historical resentment prefer communicating with each other in English. This is true despite the fact that Britain's reluctant participation in "continental" affairs has led to considerable hard feelings. Nonetheless, it is very significant that Germany is a strong supporter of pan-European English use for obvious political and economic reasons.

The second trend--reform of German universities--also represents government policies that foster the learning of English. One study explains how Germany traditionally espoused "class education," whereas the USA promoted "mass education" (keeping a higher percentage of pupils in school until age eighteen) (Max Planck Institute, 1979, p. XV). Despite attempts at reform by American occupation administrators, the FRG resisted changes until the _Wirtschaftswunder_ of the 1950s expanded the middle class and thus secondary education. There are at present three types of secondary schools in the FRG for pupils with different career goals, but all include mandatory English study. English has been obligatory in many school systems since the war, but teacher shortages limited instruction initially to big cities (Max Planck Institute). However, by 1977 all three types of secondary schools required as much English

instruction per week (four hours) as German or mathematics. All three types (including vocational) are characterized by increasing specialization on the part of teachers, since the trend towards liberal university admissions has increased the number of potential teachers and resulted in stricter qualifications (Max Planck Institute). That is to say, teachers have concentrations in English and secondary education. Government commitment to excellence and high standards all across the FRG, plus the status, economic security, and desirability of teaching positions, insures a level of motivation among teacher and pupil alike that would be the envy of American high school teachers, notwithstanding Germany's significant social problems.

As I have already stated, the liberalization of university entrance requirements has had a complex and profound effect on the motivation to learn and teach English. Pupils who were taught English went on to major in it at the university in numbers that far exceeded the national birthrate, at least in part because of the attractiveness of teaching positions in German society. This has inevitably led to massive unemployment among academics with teaching credentials (and liberal arts degrees in general (Harenberg, 1985). Teachers' unions and others, fearful of massive unemployment in an affluent society, have, in turn, encouraged lower student-teacher ratios and earlier English instruction to employ more graduates, but in a country with an aging population and

zero population growth the future is not promising.

One cannot easily distinguish between a government policy which promotes English for international communication or one which promotes English for domestic political reasons. In any case, a survey of recent research shows that the German government attempts to a great degree to promote motivation among students, and that it succeeds better than most nations.

I shall conclude this case study with an overview of recent research done at the primary school level (termed Early Start of English [ESE] in the literature), since I feel this provides the clearest evidence of government policies. In addition, much of this research has been directly inspired by the work of Gardner and Lambert in Canada and it reflects a concerted effort to promote positive attitudes "towards the English language and English-speaking people" (Schmid-Schoebein, 1980, p. 175). As German researcher Peter Doyé explains (1979, p. 32):

> The social and educational desirability of foreign language teaching at the primary level...is beyond question. The inclusion of English in the curriculum...offers a chance to avoid an ethnocentric and monocultural orientation in the young child's mind and to prepare it for international communication.

An earlier research project undertaken by Gisela Hermann sought to test the Gardner and Lambert dictum that "low ethnocentrism positively affects the learner's linguistic competence..."; specifically, she sought to investigate integrative motivation and its effects through

extensive questionnaires (Hermann, 1980, p. 247). Her conclusion was negative: "...it seems to be the learner's linguistic failure which accounts for his unfavourable response to the particular ethnolinguistic community" (p. 253). However, she felt her research further supported the FRG's whole philosophy of foreign language instruction since the 1960s--that foreign language learning had a generally positive effect on learning and the learner's affective network. However, in the case of those pupils who initially struggle with English and develop negative attitudes, Hermann believes their attitudes can improve as they continue to assimilate increased cultural information.

The most recent research into ESE that demonstrates government commitment to fostering positive attitudes is from the state of Hesse. An experiment currently in progress there resulted from a 1984 resolution of the Council for Cultural Co-operation to encourage pan-European introduction of primary school language instruction; it follows the lead of Sweden and Austria (English in grades three and four, respectively) (Gompf, 1986). Hesse's education ministry has recognized its obligation to improve the learning conditions of all pupils by stressing the growing instrumental value of English in all occupations and its practical value as a world *lingua franca* in a future German society that will presumably have leisure time "to communicate with people from all over the world, either in their home country or on vacations abroad" (Gompf, p. 19).

The researcher stresses the "enriching" and "progressive" nature of the pilot project in ESE and indicates her hope that it will also positively influence achievement in German (which lost classtime as a result of ESE) and contribute to pupil tolerance of others' lifestyles as well.

Based on all evidence available, West Germany is the clearest example of how stated government policy that is consistently carried out can positively affect student motivation. It is a country where the instrumental value of English is now paramount; indeed, the present Minister of Education, Dorothee Wilms, who is an advocate of English for scientific and technical research, has been accused of putting a cultural heritage (i.e. humanistic English study) at risk (O'Leary, 1987), but English will continue to thrive in the classroom for the reasons detailed above. West Germany's greatest educational challenge in the future will be meeting the learning needs of her significant non-German minority of guest-workers. The GDR, on the other hand, will probably continue its uncompromising commitment to polytechnical education and its official preference for Russian over English, since any real change or social reform could further undermine the credibility of the country's Communist Party.

In terms of the lessons an ESL teacher could learn from the examples of the two Germanies, perhaps the most interesting item is that West Germany adds yet another dimension of motivation actively encouraged by the

government. If one can use such terms as "blue-collar pragmatism" or "labour market planning" (Daoust-Blais, 1983) for the motivation of Francophones to learn English in Quebec, then perhaps one can use the term "leisure time planning" to describe what seems to be an emerging reason for teaching English in West Germany. East Germany, on the other hand, offers no real parallels to viable ESL markets, since it is inconceivable that a strict totalitarian state would recruit native English speakers unless it had resigned itself to the necessity of trade with the United States--as is the case at present with mainland China. Since East Germany trades mostly with West Germany and the Soviet Union, there is very little instrumental motivation to learn English.

CHAPTER V

ENGLISH IN CENTRALIZED JAPAN

I have chosen to conclude with a treatment of Japan, since it offers an interesting contrast with West Germany, and also because it represents one of the largest markets for ESL instructors. The situation in Japan is well-documented, at least in terms of Western scholars' observations, whereas in Canada, India, and Germany native researchers have written at length about their own countries' English language policies and their impact on student motivation. Part of the problem with an investigation of Japan is of course the language barrier, although some of the most negative statements about Japan's English policy are in the prestigious Japanese English-language publication the Japan Quarterly. After having reviewed recent literature on Japan's English policy, my initial impression is that although there is widespread enthusiasm among ESL instructors to go to Japan and get a job, it is an undeniable that most observers of Japanese English instruction find it very ineffective and unable to sustain student motivation. In short, a government which promotes recruitment of English teachers for both public schools and private industry may, in fact, be ambivalent

about actually encouraging motivation, although this may seem strange and unproductive.

First of all, it is important to look briefly at the nature of Japanese government and society. As I indicated in the introduction, Japan is not only very homogeneous racially but also extremely centralized in terms of educational administration. Hansen (1983, pp. 148-9) makes the following observation: "The history of educational policy from the Meiji era to the present has been one of control from the top: the Minister of Education has never been terribly responsive to the public will." Thus, although Japan is technically a democracy, its educational bureaucracy could be compared to that of the German Democratic Republic in terms of rigidity and degree of central control. In his book The Japanese Mind (1983, p. 81), Robert Christopher notes how "the Ministry of Education specifies exactly what subjects are to be taught in all elementary and junior high schools and distributes a very detailed curriculum for each course." Extreme centralization, although potentially a boon for language policy if administrators are enlightened, can also lead to widespread lethargy if central planning is inflexible.

In addition to a degree of effective central control contrasting greatly with more limited central authority in Ottawa, Delhi, or Bonn, Japan also has a feature virtually all observers stress--her sense of uniqueness or ethnic self-identity. Christopher (p. 77) refers to the Japanese

as a "tribe," while another observer (Patience, 1984, p. 212) uses the term "corporatism" to describe Japanese society and its views on an individual's obligation to the group. Writing in The Japan Quarterly (1987, p. 50), Karen Campbell says this of the Japanese classroom: "The structure of Japanese society, with its emphasis on the infallibility of authority, is distilled and condensed in the isolated world of the classroom." One must attempt to understand the ramifications of this Japanese worldview before considering government language policy and individual motivation, much as I have stressed Canada's perception of itself as bicultural and bilingual, India's maze of shifting language loyalties, and the two Germanies' interaction with and response to their neighbors and allies. Indeed, on the surface, it would seem that Japan is in an enviable position, since it clearly does not expend as much energy and money on domestic rivalries among provinces or language communities, as do Canada and India.

Japan shares with Germany the dubious distinction of having been obliterated by American bombing and then rebuilt due to a combination of foreign investment, patriotism, and hard work. Japan, however, experienced American occupation to a much more limited extent than West Germany, both in terms of time and geographic distribution, and it has never been obliged to integrate itself into the equivalent of NATO or the EEC. Thus one cannot consider English as a language of conquest, and Japan's geographic isolation still weighs

heavily on the thinking of its people, despite modern transportation systems and the nation's giant export economy. In addition, since English and Japanese are unrelated languages, there is no sense at all of the lengthy historical affinity that characterizes a German's view of English. Finally, whereas India and Canada, both former British colonies, must first resolve the status of English as an <u>intra</u>national language and its role vis-a-vis other national languages (that is to say, Hindi and French), Japan and Germany have been free to devote their energies to the role of English as an <u>inter</u>national foreign language, although their philosophies have developed along radically different lines.

Historically, the English language in Japan has fairly recent roots, beginning with the gunboat diplomacy of Commodore Perry in the last century. Maher (1984) notes that one of the highpoints of English instruction in Japan before World War II was the work of British linguist Harold Palmer (the "English through actions" method, generally viewed as the precursor of Total Physical Response), although he had a negligible effect overall, due to the rise of Japanese fascism. After the war, the influence of American ideas led to the introduction of the 6-3-3- school system, English instruction grew rapidly in scope, and the Michigan Method of structuralist Charles W. Fries gained the foothold it still widely enjoys (Maher). With a slightly sarcastic tone, Maher notes: "It has a busy-looking

appearance that lends high credibility for teachers and learners" (p. 44). Here, it seems, history conspired with pedagogy and gave the Japanese a method to teach English that suited their character and put few demands on inexperienced teachers. Maher also detects in the Japanese classroom a Japanese language-learning tradition that inhibits progress at the senior-high level--the influence of the ancient Chinese and Japanese classics. He says teachers at this level still rely on the grammar translation method to dissect English texts grammatically and syntactically as if they were literary texts. (There is an obvious parallel here with study of Latin in former times for the sake of mental discipline and likewise with India's traditional literary syllabus for entry into government service.) Edwin O. Reischauer (1977, p. 380), a respected authority on Japan, describes the reading of English by a Japanese as a "painful process of decipherment." Since the English portion of the much-feared university entrance test is entirely grammatical, out-dated teaching methodology has a direct impact on the lives of the 40% of Japanese high school students that attempt the test (Christopher, 1983).

One of the other oft-publicized problems with Japanese language policy is the training and standing of teachers--both native Japanese and foreign. Robert Christopher (1983) describes the deep philosophical differences about all aspects of education held by Americans and Japanese. In Japan, for instance, education is highly politicized, and

most secondary school teachers are members of a leftist union (Christopher). Despite this apparent contradiction, the Ministry of Education and the ruling party maintain near absolute control of curriculum and texts, so that teachers in general have little flexibility.

Christopher (1983, p. 99) maintains that Japanese English teachers "have a nitpicking knowledge of the grammatical technicalities of English but couldn't speak the language to save their lives." Karen Campbell (1987), a long-time EFL instructor at Aichi Prefectural University, concurs and says that a large majority of Japanese English teachers are insecure about their own pronunciations and are often resentful toward native speaking teachers brought in by the Ministry of Education. Another observer (Fawcett, 1982) claims that younger teachers who are aware of their failings and how to remedy them (that is, through communication) clash with their senior colleagues and administrators who speak more poorly still and are even more resistant to change. Teachers in general feel under pressure to concentrate on reading skills in order to get their students through the foreign language portion of the university exam. Thus a vicious cycle is perpetuated. Reischauer (1977) maintains that the only solution is to retrain the nation's 50,000 English teachers and to do away with the English requirement of the university examination. Any such sweeping admission of past ineffectiveness is extremely unlikely, however.

What about the thousands of native English-speaking teachers working in Japan? There is general consensus among all observers that the demand for ESL instructors is great and that Japanese of all backgrounds flock to language classes, although instruction is often poor and many teachers are unqualified (Bullock, 1984). One observer has noted a decline in the status of foreign teachers, who are often asked, "Why don't you get a real job?" (Meadley, 1987). Bullock (1984) sees at least some of the demand as merely a fad: "All [students] had their different motives: company workers studied because they were told to do so, others for fun and still others because it was the latest craze, the thing to do." Jackson Bailey, writing in the Japan Quarterly (1983, p. 134), notes how the Tokyo Ministry of Education brings into the country "relatively large numbers of native English speakers...at great cost..., but many of them are little more than kazari-mono (decorations) in the work place." The same author calls the unwillingness of local school systems to accept foreign instructors whose presence is sanctioned by the Ministry of Education a "national disgrace" (p. 134). Furthermore, Laurence Wiig (1985, p. 63) is skeptical of the true motives of some schools to hire foreigners, even well-qualified ones:

> A foreigner is likely to be hired to teach English at a senior high school in order to enhance the school's prestige, especially in its competition with other schools for qualified students. For this purpose, a foreign teacher who looks racially different from most Japanese people is likely to be given preference over other applicants.

Campbell (1987) maintains that foreign assistants at the university level can also be treated with hostility and that students go to great lengths to avoid their classes. In fact, it was not until 1983 that the first non-Japanese was granted regular faculty status at a Japanese university (Bailey, 1983).

Indeed, there exists in Japan an enormous credibility gap between the English language policy which the central government promotes and the actual motivation of students to learn English. In fact, a series of essays edited by Charles B. Wordell (1985) entitled A Guide to Teaching English in Japan on occasion reads more like a jungle survival guide for ESL instructors. In one of these essays, Lawrence Wiig (p. 62) claims English is universally studied in senior high schools because "for policymakers in education, it is a way of simplifying an overly complex world; there are only two languages on the planet that really matter: Japanese and English."

On a more sinister note, Karen Campbell (1987, p. 46) stresses the role of Japanese ultranationalism and its effect on student motivation to study foreign languages: "For years scholars have been proving to the satisfaction of the Japanese people that the Japanese are either unique or superior in customs, emotions, language, even the design of their brains." She maintains that the government is simultaneously pursuing the contradictory path of internationalization and ultranationalism, the result being

"a naively unconscious ethnocentrism" (p. 46). The same observer also maintains that secondary school teachers of English, who are insecure about their own ability and frustrated by the system, pass on their own bad attitudes and give the impression that English is a language of bluntness, whereas Japanese is a language of subtlety and politeness.

Several scholars have commented on the percentage of classtime devoted to English in the curriculum. In contrast with West Germany, which has experimented with an ever earlier introduction of English into the primary school (even at the expense of German), Japan has done just the opposite: English class hours per week have actually dropped by 40% since the 1960s--from 5 to 3 or less (Tanaka Steinberg, 1985). Many teachers were upset with the reduction in hours mandated by the Ministry of Education's New Course of Study, since it puts them under increased pressure, and they argue it will simply increase the popularity of private "cram" schools (Maher, 1984). The end result of poor teaching is that the Japanese must put up with two more years of English at the university, just as East Germans are obliged to continue with Russian.

Tanaka Steinberg (1985) also points out how initially there is much enthusiasm among seventh graders to learn English, although this dissipates quickly in the atmosphere of grammar translation. In addition, Maher (1984) believes that the communicative difficulties of English are usually

severely misrepresented, thus leading to great frustration. Campbell (1987, p. 50) feels that the frustration of pupils, coupled with underlying ultranationalistic tendencies, contributes to a negative attitude towards English:

> It seems clear to me that the sufferings and pressures heaped on students in the name of English are responsible for much of their growing resentment toward English-speaking countries and their attempts to prove them inferior to, or different from, Japan.

Interestingly, this observation agrees with recent research of Hermann (1980) in Germany on attitudes among pupils--that is to say, lack of success with a language can manifest itself in hostility toward speakers of it. Wiig (1985, p. 62) says somewhat cynically of pre-university English instruction in Japanese public schools:

> It is part of an elaborate, intense rite of passage in which the more ambitious of the young people in this country demonstrate their capacity for drudgery and self-denial to the powers-that-be, and, in so doing, hope that they will be granted admission to the institutions of higher learning, which will lead to the best jobs the society has to offer.

Thus, for the vast majority of Japanese, motivation to learn English is of a very narrow instrumental nature--the need to pass a written, fill-in-the-blank entrance test. Fawcett (1982) and Maher (1984) note that there are some reform-minded scholars, especially younger ones, who recognize the inadequacy of the whole philosophy of current English instruction, but Christopher (1983, p. 91) doubts there will be any sudden changes: "For unlike Japanese intellectuals, the great majority of Japan's people are

pragmatists, and in pragmatic terms, the Japanese educational system has served the country well..."

In contrast with the unanimity among scholars as regards the shortcomings of classroom practices, there is some disagreement about the overall instrumental value of English to Japan as a nation. Maher (1984, p. 42) states that English "maintains the thrust of Japan's international economic expansion today" and that "it is an essential and powerful enzyme which assists the flow of communication to and from Japan's industrial, political and cultural entities." Wilg (1985, p. 63), on the other hand, has a different point of view:

> A marginal ability in reading English on the part of masses of Japanese people serves a commercial purpose in a business world that relies heavily on foreign trade for its prosperity. A fair number of employees in Japan are occasionally called upon to dissect a letter from abroad, or a pamphlet or advertisement in English. Even persons involved in the creation of advertising copy for internal consumption in Japan need to use a smattering of English words and phrases in their work.

I feel there is not necessarily a contradiction here. Although fluent English is obviously an asset for a Japanese trade representative who is a product of the nations's best university and resides in Manhattan, an average Japanese employee will probably use the language infrequently if at all.

There are also other factors within Japanese society that set real limits on motivation towards English. Greenless (1986, p. 16c) points out how high schools do not want to seem overly preoccupied with English for fear

students will become "English mongers" who neglect their native tongue. Based upon his experience at a Japanese senior high school, Wiig (1985, p. 72) notes that there is very little parental encouragement to learn English at the PTA level: "...only the rarest of parents would make an inquiry to any English teacher, Japanese or foreign, as to how the parent might help her daughter study English better."

The Japanese, like the West Germans, have become prosperous through their exports and enjoy travel greatly, as anyone who has been to Europe can attest. However, because of their poor English skills, Fawcett (1982, p. 13) maintains they feel inadequate: "Westerners travel happily all over the world--when the Japanese go abroad they are laughed at." The Japanese have made tremendous strides in educational television programming in different languages (Christopher, 1983), but most observers agree that this quest to become the world's first "information society" will not compensate for their basic feeling of inadequacy. Indeed, it is irrelevant how much information is available if people are not motivated to take advantage of it. As John Greenless (1986, p. 16c) puts it, "The problem, as ever for the Japanese, is how to introduce new ideas while, at the same time, retaining and protecting the important traditional elements of the country's language and culture."

Finally, there is another trend that may bode ill for the future and counteract the gradual, slow changes that are

taking place to improve the quality of English instruction. In 1985, a council sponsored by the Ministry of Education suggested that the number of foreign students in Japan reach 100,000 by the turn of the century--a ten-fold increase (Yuji, 1986). Such an increase would require a vast teacher-training program and is contingent upon the value of the Yen, but it may represent implicit rejection of the instrumental value of English in favor of Japanese, since there is no denying the economic power of Japan in all of Asia. Recently I discussed this subject with a Korean graduate student of mine who had studied in Japan. He noted that his own experience with Japanese-language classes had been negative and felt Japan would be extremely hard-pressed to ever attract 100,000 foreign students.

It is clear that Japan at present furnishes the ESL teacher with great financial opportunities--and just as many sources of frustration. Since it was never an English colony with Anglo-Saxon institutions and its language is non-Germanic, English is clearly an <u>inter</u>national language for the Japanese. However, because of its geographical isolation and cultural restraints, Japan will never use English as a language of wider communication to the extent that West Germany does. Likewise, there is no indication that Japan is interested in early start of English and there seems to be little indication that English will ever be taught for the humanistic reasons overtly espoused by some modern Germans. Finally, since there are far fewer liberal

arts majors in Japan than in Germany, there is little pressure to teach English earlier in order to create jobs.

The Japanese Ministry of Education, despite its window-dressing with foreign native-speaking teachers, is guilty of equivocation as regards its true degree of commitment to enhance individual motivation to learn English. It is to be hoped that, for a variety of historical and cultural reasons, Japan represents an extreme example of the degree of skepticism an ESL instructor should have as regards the stated goals of the host country's English-language policy.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In this final chapter, I shall interpret the data I have presented on Quebec, India, Germany, and Japan in terms of Strevens' four-part flow chart (1978) illustrating the process of language learning in a formal curriculum. As I stated in the introduction, I am assuming that motivation--whatever form it takes--is the most important element in determining success of an ESL or EFL curriculum.

In my opinion, an ESL instructor contemplating working abroad is most likely to deal with what Strevens (1978, p. 181) terms the "community," merely because modern states operate "from the top down"; a teacher must deal with government representatives and receives officially sanctioned information--for the most part. As I also indicated in the introduction, it is the subcomponent of the community that Strevens terms the "public will" (p. 184) which is most important for this thesis: the degree to which a government has an explicitly stated English language policy.

Based upon this survey of the public will to have students learn English in the four case areas, I feel it is necessary to use extreme caution. As ESL instructor simply

cannot take even an explicitly stated English language policy at face value. Thus I feel this basic element of Strevens' model is more problematic in terms of predicting success (as manifested in positive motivation) than is, for example, an analysis of the "teacher" or the "language teaching profession" (the other two components that, together with the "learner," complete Strevens' diagram). That is to say, it may be readily apparent that a Japanese English teacher cannot sustain student motivation or that West German English teachers are highly motivated and competent in order to get rare and highly sought after positions, but it is nearly impossible to establish whether a government ministry of education actually is sincere when it promotes study of ESL or EFL. As Cobarubbias and Fishman (1983, p. 63) note, this matter is the "most neglected area of language planning, in spite of the fact that ideologies underlie all forms of status planning."

There is no simple answer to this dilemma; my goal has been merely to draw attention to it in four different political entities in order that the ESL or EFL instructor can more readily recognize a potential source of frustration. It would, however, be worthwhile to attempt to determine if non-democratic states are more consistent in "practicing what they preach" as regards promotion of foreign language learning. Cobarubbias and Fishman (1983, p. 63) note how the role of language planners is very different in a democratic society, since "language policy

decisions have to conform to language ideologies believed to be upheld by representative groups." If the German Democratic Republic is representative of non-democratic states in terms of available information, the prospects for comparing the consistency of non-democratic with democratic ministries of education are bleak indeed.

Perhaps more helpful to an ESL instructor going to a host country is an analysis of the degree to which that government can implement _any_ decision nationwide, English-language related or otherwise. India represents an extreme example of a nation that is so diverse and complex that it is improbable to expect much of a relationship between the public will as stated in the constitution and legislation, and the learner at the other end of Strevens' model. There are simply too many logistical factors that can impede the "flow" of the flow chart.

Canada likewise represents an example of how a relatively decentralized form of government, at least as regards educational policy, can make the flow diagram something less than operable. In fact, in nations such as India and Canada, which are bicultural or multi-cultural and politically decentralized or fragmented, it is perhaps better to apply Strevens' model only to that state or province under discussion--Quebec or Ontario, let us say, or Bengal or the Punjab.

In culturally and linguistically homogeneous states such as Japan or the two Germanies, there is more potential

for Strevens' four-part flow diagram to operate intact and fewer chances for a breakdown. However, Campbell (1987) has noted how Japan seems to be pursuing the contradictory policy of promoting ultranationalism and chauvinism on the one hand (and reducing the hours of English instruction), yet providing one of the biggest markets for ESL professionals.

In fact, of the political entities surveyed in this thesis, only the Federal Republic of Germany represents an example of a nation where the ministries of education at federal and state level set the tone of consistency in promoting English that is manifested at the level of the language teaching profession, the teacher, and the learner. Indeed, such an extreme example of dedication to English study is perhaps only possible in a society that is secure in its own cultural identity and very clear about the instrumental value of English.

Strevens' four-part flow chart to illustrate the nature of foreign language learning in an organized curriculum is very helpful to the ESL or EFL instructor for conceptualizing the different components that are involved in language learning success (as manifested by positive motivation). This is true despite the fact that the first component of this model, the community, is not always a trustworthy source for determining the true degree to which a ministry of education wants to foster positive attitudes towards the learning of English. I feel it is preferable to

concentrate on analyzing the public will, but this is also problematic in view of the difficulty of constructing reliable attitudinal questionnaires free from bureaucratic tampering. An analysis of the status of English in a host country in terms of this model should nevertheless prove useful to the ESL or EFL professional and hopefully will reduce the level of frustration an instructor might encounter. In short, it can be as helpful for conceptualizing a very complex process as is Krashen's Monitor Model for grasping the nature of language acquisition.

REFERENCES

Abraham, A. S. (1983, December 20). Indians mind their language. Times Higher Education Supplement, p. 7e.

Abraham, A. S. (1985, November 18). Premier calls for new stress on English. Times Educational Supplement, p. 14e.

Bailey, J. (1983). Cultural exchange: Theorey and practice. The Japan Quarterly, 30(2), 133-134.

Bullock, D. (1985, June 28). How deep is your bow? Times Educational Supplement, p. 52.

Campbell, K. L. (1987). Ultranationalism in the English-language classroom. The Japan Quarterly, 34(1), 46-50.

Childs, D. (1983). The GDR: Moscow's German ally. London: Allen and Unwin.

Chopra, P. N. (Ed.). (1973). The gazetteer of India (7th ed.). Delhi: Ministry of Education and Social Welfare.

Christopher, R. C. (1983). The Japanese mind. New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Cobarubbias, J. (1983). Ethical issues in status planning In J. Cobarubbias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), Progress in language planning (pp. 41-85). Berlin: Mouton.

Collison, D. (1980). A bilingual experiment in a German school. English Language Teaching Journal, 34, 270-277.

Couto, M. (1982, September 3). The empire striking back. Times Higher Education Supplement, p. 9.

Daoust-Blais, D. (1983). Corpus and status language planning in Quebec: A look at linguistic education. In J. Cobarubbias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), Progress in language planning (pp. 207-234). Berlin: Mouton.

Deth, J. P. Van (1987). L'engseignement scolaire des langues vivantes dans les pays membres de la communaute europeenne: Bilans, reflexions et propositions. Association Internationale pour la Recherche et la

Diffusion de Methodes Audio-visuelles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 279 207)

Doye, P. (1979). Primary English: A research project on the teaching of English in German primary schools. English Language Teaching Journal, 34, 29-34.

Ek, J. Van (1975). Threshold level English. Oxford: Pergamon.

Fawcett, T. (1982, December 24). Enthousiasm hampered by method. Times Educational Supplement, p. 13.

Fishman, J. (1983). Modeling rationales in corpus planning: Modernity and tradition in images of the good corpus. In J. Cobarubbias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), Progress in language planning (pp. 107-118). Berlin: Mouton.

Fletcher, P. (1986, March 7). Core curriculum planning: part two of the great debate. Times Educational Supplement, p. 15.

Gagnon, M. (1974). Linguistic attitudes of French adolescents in Canada. Quebec: Laval University, International Center for Research on Bilingualism. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Nr. ED 184 329).

Gerson, M. (1983, January 26). Quebec's 3 English-language universities may get new form and function. The The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 21-22.

Gompf, G. (1986). The early start of English--Recent trends and new directions in the Federal Republic of Germany. International Review of Education, 32, 3-22.

Gopah, S. (Ed.). (1980). Jawaharlal Nehru: An anthology. Delhi: Oxford UP.

Greenless, J. (1986, April 26). "English mongers" wanted. Times Educational Supplement, p. 16c.

Guntermann, T. G. (1985). Strategies and methods for high schools. In C. B. Wordell (Ed.), A guide to teaching English in Japan (pp. 125-144). Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Hamers, J. F. (1984). L'evolution des attitudes envers la langue seconde et l'identite culturelle chez les jeunes Quebecois francophones et anglophones. Canadian Modern Language Review, 41(2), 283-307.

Hansen, H. E. (1985). English education in Japanese

universities and its social context. In C. B. Wordell (Ed.), A guide to teaching English in Japan (pp. 145-157). Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Harenberg, W. (1985, May 13). Arbeitlose akademiker. Der Spiegel, pp. 40-67.

Hermann, G. (1980). Attitudes and success in children's learning of English as a second language: The motivational versus the resultative hypothesis. English Language Teaching Journal, 34, 247-254.

India: A reference manual. (1981). Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.

Judd, E. L. (1981). Language policy, curriculum development, and TESOL instruction: A search for compatibility. TESOL Quarterly, 15(1), 59-65.

Kachru, B. B. (1976). Models of English for the Third World: White man's linguistic burden or language pragmatics? TESOL Quarterly, 10(2), 221-238.

Kachru, B. B. (1981). The pragmatics of non-native varieties of English. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), English for cross-cultural communication (pp. 18-37). New York: St. Martin's.

Kachru, B. B. (1983). Models of new Englishes. In J. Cobarubbias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), Progress in language planning (pp. 145-170). Berlin: Mouton.

Khubchandani, L. M. (1983). Plural languages, plural cultures. Honolulu: U. of Hawaii Press.

Krauer, S. (1987, June 10, 16). Lieben Sie die Amis? Stern, pp. 75-91, 88-92.

Lieven, A. (1984, June 1). English dominates Indian publishing. Times Higher Education Supplement, p. 9.

Long, W. (1981, July 15). Times Educational Supplement, p. 15e.

McCauley, M. (1983). The German Democratic Republic since 1945. New York: St. Martin's.

Mackey, W. F. (1983). U.S. language status policy and the Canadian experience. In J. Cobarubbias and J. A. Fishman (Eds.), Progress in language planning (pp. 173-206). Berlin: Mouton.

Maher, J. C. (1984). English language education in Japan:

Historical and macro-issues in the teaching of English in schools. Language Learning and Communication, 92, 41-50.

Max Planck Institute. (1979). Between elite and mass education: Education in the Federal Republic of Germany. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Nagarajan, S. (1981). The decline of English in India: Some historical notes. College English, 43, 663-670.

Nath, U. R. (1986, July 11). Expurgating the raj. Times Educational Supplement, p. 14.

Nelson, J. E., & Rebuffot, J. J. (1984). A sociolinguistic study of Montreal. Canadian Modern Language Review, 40 (2), 360-373.

O'Leary, J. (1987, February 21). Meeting of minds who think alike. Times Higher Education Supplement, p. 21.

Ow, B. von. (1985, May 10). Times Higher Education Supplement, p. 10a.

Patience, A. (1984). A comparison of Japanese and Australian university systems. The Japan Quarterly, 31 (2), 206-213.

Prator, C. H. (1968). The British heresy in TESL. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), Language problems in developing nations (pp. 459-476). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Reischauer, E. O. (1977). The Japanese. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

Repka, R. (1986). The process of ELT reform in Czechoslovakian schools. English Language Teaching Journal, 40(3), 221-226.

Rust, V. D. (Ed.). (1984). Education in East and West Germany. New York: Garland.

Schechter, S. (1980). Teaching EFL in a unilingual Quebec. Canadian Modern Language Review, 36(2), 201-214.

Schmid-Schoenbein, G. (1980). Evaluation of the teaching of English to German children of pre-school age. English Language Teaching Journal, 34, 173-179.

Seright, L. (1985). Age and aural comprehension achievement in francophone adults learning English. TESOL Quarterly, 19(3), 455-473.

Shaw, W. D. (1981). Asian student attitudes towards English. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), English for cross-cultural communication (pp. 108-120). New York: St. Martin's.

Smith, L. E. (1981). Introduction. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), English for cross-cultural communication. New York: St. Martin's.

Spear, P. (Ed.). (1981). The Oxford history of India. Delhi: Oxford UP.

Steinberg, M. T. (1985). English instruction in Japanese junior high schools. In C. B. Wordell (Ed.), A guide to teaching English in Japan (pp. 95-124). Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Stern, H. H. (1981). Unity and diversity in L2 teaching: English in non-native settings from a Canadian perspective. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), English for cross-cultural communication (pp. 59-70). New York: St. Martins.

Stern, H. H. (1982). French core programs across Canada: How can we improve them? Canadian Modern Language Review 39(1), 314-347.

Strevens, P. (1980). Teaching English as an international language. Oxford: Pergamon.

Sutherland, P. (1981, January 8). It's our party. Times Educational Supplement, p. 19b.

Ulbrecht, W. (1968). On questions of socialist construction. Berlin: Verlag Zeit im Bild.

UNESCO statistical yearbook. (1986). Paris: UNESCO.

Wilg, L. M. (1985). Teaching in senior high schools. In C. B. Wordell (Ed.), A guide to teaching English in Japan (pp. 61-88). Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Wolport, S. (1965). India. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yuji, O. (1986). A tsunami of language learners. The Japan Quarterly, 33(1), 8-12.

VITA 2

Dana D. Ebbett

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: NATIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE POLICY AND INDIVIDUAL MOTIVATION: FOUR CASE STUDIES

Major Field: English (TESL Option)

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Hamilton, Georgia, October 13, 1955, the son of Dean W. and Polly Ebbett.

Education: Graduated from Harris County High School, Hamilton, Georgia, in June, 1972; received Bachelor of Arts Degree in Classics from Georgia State University in Atlanta, Georgia, in June, 1976; completed requirements for the Master of Arts Degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1988.

Professional Experience: English Instructor, City Colleges of Chicago, Berlin, Germany, January, 1981, to October, 1983; Teaching Assistant, Department of English, Oklahoma State University, August, 1985, to May, 1988.

Professional Organizations: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL); Oklahoma Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (OKTESOL).